



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,139	09/09/2003	Shinji Ohuchi	KKH.039D2	1910
20987	7590	02/11/2008	EXAMINER	
VOLENTINE & WHITT PLLC ONE FREEDOM SQUARE 11951 FREEDOM DRIVE SUITE 1260 RESTON, VA 20190		NGUYEN, DILINH P		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2814		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		02/11/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/657,139	OHUCHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DILINH NGUYEN	2814

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 34-37, 46 and 53-58.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

/Theresa T. Doan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Lin et al. reference does not disclose a CSP type semiconductor device having a semiconductor element.

Applicant's argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive because Lin et al. disclose a semiconductor device comprising: a structure size package type semiconductor device having a semiconductor element 50 (a resistor, a diode, a decoupling capacitor, or the like) (figs. 6-7, column 6, lines 62-63). The semiconductor element 50 (resistor, diode, decoupling capacitor) of Lin et al. is a chip size package type semiconductor device. Note Lee et al. (U.S. Pat. 6081037) column 1, lines 54-60 and Bessho (U.S. Pub. 2001/0014523) paragraph 0024, line 7 are cited to support for the well known position. Thus, Lin et al. disclose the CSP type semiconductor device having a semiconductor element.

Applicant argues that Lin et al. reference does not teach, suggest or address whether component 50 is covered with resin or not and the Okuno et al. reference does not disclose or suggest the idea of mounting a CSP type semiconductor device on the backside of a base plate of a BGA type semiconductor device.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because this argument has no immediate apparent relevance to the issues presented by the rejection before us since an appellant cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually wherein the rejection is based upon a combination of references. In re Young, 403 F. 2d 754, 757, 159 USPQ 725, 728 (CCPA 1968). It should be noted that the rejection of claims 34-37, 46 and 53-58 are not based on anticipation, but rather, are based on obviousness. Examiner relies on the combined teachings at Lin et al. in view of Okuno et al.

Lin et al. is not relied on for teaching that the semiconductor device is covered with resin. Lin et al. is relied on for showing a CSP type semiconductor device on the backside of a base plate of a BGA type semiconductor device.

Okuno et al. is only relied on for teaching a CSP type semiconductor device has a resin that covers the main surface of the semiconductor element and side surface of the terminals and portion of each of the plurality of terminals are exposed from the resin (fig. 8, abstract). Therefore, Lin et al. in view of Okuno et al. disclose all the limitations as required by claims 34 and 53.

The IDS filed 10/30/2007 has not been considered by the Examiner because it filed after the mailing date of the Final Rejection dated 08/21/2007.